

### **REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-21 are currently pending in the subject application. Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 are independent.

By this amendment, claims 3 and 12 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, and 13-21 are amended to correct minor grammatical inconsistencies contained therein in response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and objections thereto and/or to include features of one of the cancelled claims, i.e., previously considered subject matter. No new matter is added. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested as the amendments do not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration, and thus, do not burden the Examiner.

#### **A. Introduction**

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner objected to claims 1-15 because of language informalities; rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement; rejected claims 1-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention; and rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,050,789 to Kallio et al. ("the Kallio et al. reference") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,859,821 to Ozzie et al. ("the Ozzie et al. reference").

#### **B. Objection to Claims 1-15**

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner objected to claims 1-15 because of language informalities. Particular language in independent claims 1 and 10 was identified as forming the basis of the objection.

Claims 1-6 and 10-15 are amended to correct minor grammatical errors contained therein. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

C. Rejection of Claims 1-15 as Failing to Comply with the Written Description Requirement

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Particular language in independent claims 1 and 10 was identified as forming the basis of the rejection.

Claims 1-6 and 10-15 are amended to correct the identified language therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

D. Rejection of Claims 1-15 as Failing to Comply with the Enablement Requirement

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Particular language in independent claims 1 and 10 was identified as forming the basis of the rejection.

Claims 1-6 and 10-15 are amended to correct the identified language therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

E. Asserted Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims 1-15 and 17-18.

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Particular language in claims 1, 10 and 17 was identified as forming the basis of the rejection.

Claims 1-6, 10-15 and 17 are amended to correct the identified language therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

F. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-21

In the outstanding Office Action Made Final, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kallio et al. reference in view of the Ozzie et al. reference. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

At page 7 of the Office action, the Examiner acknowledges that the Kallio et al. reference fails to disclose a temporary address set created by randomly transforming a unique MAC address of a wireless terminal, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 19. The Examiner relies on col. 23, lines 51-60 of the Ozzie et al. reference for overcoming the deficiencies of the Kallio et al. reference.

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the Ozzie et al. reference also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a temporary address set created by randomly transforming a unique MAC address of a wireless terminal, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 19.

The Ozzie et al. reference may merely disclose using a network adapter's MAC address as a seed for a generator and creating a 32 byte value that may be capable guaranteeing uniqueness of a person among multiple users of a device, or devices among multiple computers used by the same person. That is, according to the Ozzie et al. reference, a single number, which may be generated based on a network adapter's MAC address, may be used to uniquely identify a person or device. In the system disclosed by the Ozzie et al. reference, which is directed to a technique for allowing users at various remote sites to share and edit documents on a peer-to-peer basis, while maintaining consistent copies of the documents at local sites (col. 3, lines 38-40), there is no need for a person and/or a device to have a set, e.g., more than one, of unique values based on the network adapter's MAC address. Further, in the system disclosed by the Ozzie et al. reference, providing more than one value would be contrary to providing a "unique" value to a person or a device, i.e., the

Ozzie et al. reference teaches away from providing a set of values for a person or device.

That is, the Ozzie et al. reference may assign a single unique designation, i.e., **not a set** of unique designations, to each endpoint of each of the telespace members, and each designation may indicate the order in which the member joined the telespace (col. 21, lines 41-48). For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the Ozzie et al. reference also fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, a temporary address set created by randomly transforming a unique MAC address of a wireless terminal, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 19.

Further, as neither the Kallio et al. nor the Ozzie et al. references disclose or suggest, creating a temporary address set, the Kallio et al. and the Ozzie et al. references also fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, **selecting** an address from the created temporary address set.

Additionally, as neither the Kallio et al. nor the Ozzie et al. references disclose or suggest, creating a temporary address set, the Kallio et al. and the Ozzie et al. references also fail to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, the wireless access node encoding the temporary address set using a predetermined encryption key for the temporary address set, and transmitting the encoded temporary address set to the wireless terminal, as now recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in each of independent claims 10, 16 and 19. More particularly, at page 8 of the Office action, the Examiner asserts that col. 3, line 41 – col. 4, line 24 of the Kallio et al. reference discloses such features. However, applicants respectfully disagree at least because the identified portion of the Kallio et al. reference merely discloses when a terminal requests a key from a key server, if there is no identified provided corresponding to the requesting terminal or the user thereof, the server may create an “anonymity address” for the terminal. The creation of such an “anonymity address” does not, however, correspond in any way to encoding a created temporary address set and transmitting the encoded temporary address set to the wireless terminal.

Further, even assuming for the sake of argument that the Ozzie et al. reference overcame the deficiencies of the Kallio et al. reference, as applied to claims 1, 10, 16 and 19, the Ozzie et al. reference and/or the Kallio et al. reference fail to provide any motivation or suggestion to combine their teachings to disclose the subject matter of each of independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 19. That is, the Kallio et al. reference is directed to a system/method providing for the use and/or distribution of keys employable in accessing services, and may provide an “anonymity address” for a terminal. Such an “anonymity address” should have no relation to any identifier corresponding to the terminal, its user, etc. (col. 3, lines 41-48 of the Kallio et al. reference). One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of the Ozzie et al. reference with regard to using a network adapter’s MAC address as a seed for a generator and creating a 32 byte value and has an explicit relationship with, i.e., is based on, the network adapter’s address to generate the “anonymity address” of a terminal according to the Kallio et al. reference.

For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the combination of the Kallio et al. reference and the Ozzie et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in each of independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 19, as well as all the features of claims 2, 4-9, 11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20 and 21, which directly or indirectly depend from one of claims 1, 10, 16 and 19. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

G. Conclusion

The remaining documents cited by the Examiner were not relied on to reject the claims. Therefore, no comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: August 21, 2007

 5292  
Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

LEE & MORSE, P.C.  
3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 500  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042  
703.207.0008 TEL  
703.207.0003 FAX

PETITION and  
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.